

Serial No. 10/727,088  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed August 13, 2009, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-67, 69-90 and 94-119 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-28, 31-65, 69-90, and 94-119 stand rejected. Claims 29, 30, 66, and 67 have been withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in light of the arguments presented herein.

**RESPONSES TO PRIOR ARGUMENTS**

As an initial matter, Applicants note that the Examiner has failed to address or respond to the specific arguments set forth in Applicants' Amendment filed on March 13, 2008, Pre-Appeal Brief filed on August 18, 2008, Amendment filed on March 2, 2009, and Amendment filed on July 20, 2009, other than to state that "Applicant[s'] arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) or rejection" or "Applicant[s'] amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection." Office Action of October 1, 2008, p. 2, Final Office Action of April 20, 2009, p. 7, and Office Action of August 13, 2009, p. 2. Applicants submit that such an approach to examination is clearly contrary to established examination guidelines because it encourages piecemeal examination. Particularly, Applicants note that "[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it." M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f) (emphasis added).

Applicants' arguments in the above-mentioned responses provide specific reasons rebutting the Examiner's alleged *prima facie* case of obviousness. However, since the Examiner has not addressed Applicants' arguments, Applicants have been unable to prepare appropriate responses thereto. In order for Applicants to continue to advance prosecution, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide specific responses to the arguments presented herein.

**Serial No. 10/727,088**  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

**DURATION OF PROSECUTION**

The obviousness rejections in the Office Action of August 13, 2009, rely primarily on U.S. Patent No. 5,449,041 to Galbraith ("Galbraith") and U.S. Patent No. 6,019,861 to Canterbury et al. ("Canterberry"). Applicants note that a similar combination of Galbraith and Canterbury was relied upon by the Examiner in the Final Office Action of June 16, 2008, p. 2. In response to the Final Office Action of June 16, 2008, Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief on August 15, 2008, in which the rejections in light of Galbraith and Canterbury were addressed. On September 25, 2008, a Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review was transmitted, in which prosecution was reopened and the previous rejections were withdrawn. In the Office Action of October 1, 2008, the Examiner relied upon Galbraith in combination with additional references. This fact, in combination with the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review, indicated to Applicants that the previous rejections in light of Galbraith and Canterbury had been overcome.

However, prosecution now appears to have come full circle in that the Examiner, one year later, is relying upon the same combination of Galbraith and Canterbury to reject the pending claims, even though rejections in light of that combination of references had been previously addressed by Applicants and withdrawn by the Examiner. In addition, Applicants note that this application has been pending for over 5.5 years and has undergone substantial prosecution. However, little progress has been made to advance the application to allowance.

Applicants respectfully request prompt and favorable resolution of the remaining rejections in order to advance prosecution to issuance of a notice of allowability.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections****Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury**

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 18, 22-25, 57-65, 69, 72-75, 77, 78, 96-106, and 115-119 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974); *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Additionally, the Examiner must determine whether there is “an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740-1741, 167 L.Ed.2d 705, 75 USLW 4289, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007). Further, rejections on obviousness grounds “cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *Id.* at 1741, quoting *In re Kahn*, 441, F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006). Finally, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Furthermore, the reason that would have prompted the combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself, and not based on the Applicant’s disclosure. *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C. H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2006); M.P.E.P. § 2144. Underlying the obvious determination is the fact that statutorily prohibited hindsight cannot be used. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1742; *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1367.

The obviousness rejection of claims 1-5, 7-14, 18, 22-25, 57-65, 69, 72-75, 77, 78, 96-106, and 115-119 is improper because Galbraith and Canterbury do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. In addition, there is no reason to modify the references in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

Galbraith teaches a method and apparatus for suppressing a fire. Galbraith at column 1, lines 6-10. A solid propellant 14 in the apparatus is ignited to produce a first gas that includes carbon dioxide (“CO<sub>2</sub>”), nitrogen, and water vapor. *Id.* at column 3, lines 3-5 and lines 64-67. The solid propellant is an azide-based or an azole-based mixture. *Id.* at column 4, line 23-column 5, line 11. In one embodiment of the apparatus, illustrated in FIG. 1, ignition of the solid propellant 14 produces a first gas 16, which is used to vaporize a vaporizable liquid 18 and form

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

a second gas 24. *Id.* at column 3, lines 29-37. The second gas 24 is expelled from the apparatus and used to suppress a fire. *Id.* at column 5, lines 53-56. The solid propellant 14 is surrounded by a cooling material 38, such as magnesium carbonate. *Id.* at column 5, lines 29-32. When the cooling material 38 is heated, such as upon ignition of the solid propellant 14, additional CO<sub>2</sub> is generated. *Id.* at column 5, lines 32-34. In another embodiment of the apparatus, illustrated in FIG. 4, the first gas 16 produced by ignition of the solid propellant 14 is used directly as a fire suppressant. *Id.* at column 7, lines 41-44. The first gas 16 includes nitrogen, CO<sub>2</sub>, and water vapor. Ignition of the solid propellant 14 also causes a magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72 to ignite, producing magnesium oxide and additional CO<sub>2</sub>. *Id.* at column 7, lines 45-50. The first gas 16 and additional CO<sub>2</sub> flow through a magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76, which produces additional CO<sub>2</sub> upon heating. *Id.* at column 7, lines 51-54. A model of the embodiment of the apparatus illustrated in FIG. 4 describes that 3.1 pounds of CO<sub>2</sub> are produced by the magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72 and 6.9 pounds of CO<sub>2</sub> are produced by the magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76.

Canterberry teaches a gas generating composition that includes a non-azide fuel, ammonium nitrate, and silicon. Canterberry at the Abstract. The non-azide fuel is guanidine nitrate, oxamide, ammonium oxalate, aminoguanidine bicarbonate, hydrazodicarbonamide, azodicarbonamide, a tetrazole, a bitetrazole, a triazole, or mixtures thereof. *Id.* at column 4, line 65 through column 5, line 2. Gas generating compositions that included 5-aminotetrazole, ammonium oxalate, or azodicarbonamide as the non-azide fuel were formulated. *Id.* at column 8, line 29 through column 10, line 20, and Table I. Gas generating compositions that included the 5-aminotetrazole as the non-azide fuel were combusted to determine the amount of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitric oxide, and nitrogen dioxide produced. *Id.* at column 8, line 29 through column 10, line 20, and Table II. Industry standards of desirable levels of gaseous reaction products of gas generants are shown in Table III. *Id.* at column 10, lines 24-50. The gaseous reaction products include carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide. *Id.* The gas generating composition is potentially used in a fire suppression device. *Id.* at column 4, lines 44-45.

Serial No. 10/727,088  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

Canterberry is silent regarding details of such a fire suppression device and its operation.

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 18, 22-25, 96-100, and 115

Galbraith and Canterberry, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1 because nothing in Galbraith or Canterberry teaches or suggests the limitation of "the at least one gas generant comprising a non-azide, non-azole, non-aminoguanidine nitrate, non-triaminoguanidine nitrate composition formulated to pyrotechnically produce no sodium chloride and an inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide at a concentration less than or equal to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration of carbon dioxide." Galbraith does not teach or suggest this limitation because its solid propellants are azide- or azole-based. In addition, Galbraith does not teach or suggest that the solid propellants used in its apparatus produce carbon dioxide at a concentration less than or equal to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration. While Galbraith discloses that carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and water vapor are produced upon ignition of the solid propellant, Galbraith does not teach relative amounts of the produced gases.

Canterberry also does not teach or suggest the claimed gas concentration limitation. The Examiner states that Tables II and III show that the gas generating compositions of Canterberry, when combusted, produce levels of carbon dioxide that are less than the desirable levels and that these desirable levels are equivalent to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentrations. Office Action of Office Action of August 13, 2009, p. 2. However, the gas analysis results shown in Table II are for gas generating compositions that include 5-aminotetrazole (an azole) as the non-azide fuel. Since these combustion results are for gas generating compositions that include 5-aminotetrazole, these do not support the Examiner's assertion because these gas generating compositions are not non-azole compositions as recited in claim 1. While Canterberry teaches that oxamide may be used as the fuel, Canterberry does not teach or suggest specific compositions that include oxamide. Therefore, Canterberry does not and cannot teach or suggest the amounts of carbon dioxide produced upon combustion of a composition that includes

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

oxamide. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect an oxamide-containing composition, upon combustion, to produce a greater amount of carbon dioxide than is produced by a similar composition that contains 5-aminotetrazole. Such an oxamide-containing composition would produce more carbon dioxide because oxamide (chemical formula of  $C_2H_2N_2H_4$ ) includes two atoms of carbon per mole of oxamide compared to 5-aminotetrazole (chemical formula  $CH_3N_5$ ), which includes one atom of carbon per mole of 5-aminotetrazole.

Galbraith and Canterbury also do not teach or suggest the limitation of “the fire suppression system configured to dispel, at an exit thereof, the inert gas mixture to provide a dispelled inert gas mixture into a space, the dispelled inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one gas generant.” Galbraith does not teach or suggest this limitation because Galbraith does not teach or suggest relative amounts of the produced gases or relative amounts of the gases that are directed from the apparatus and into the environment. Galbraith also does not teach or suggest this limitation because the apparatus of Galbraith includes cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, and/or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76, each of which produces  $CO_2$  when heated, which occurs upon ignition of the solid propellant 14, *i.e.*, when the apparatus of Galbraith is used. The  $CO_2$  produced by the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76 is in addition to the  $CO_2$  produced by ignition of the solid propellant 14. The  $CO_2$  produced by ignition of the solid propellant 14 and the  $CO_2$  produced by the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, and/or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76 exit the apparatus and are used to suppress the fire. Since the gases exiting the apparatus of Galbraith include  $CO_2$  *in addition to* the  $CO_2$  produced by the combustion of the solid propellant 14, Galbraith does not teach or suggest that “the dispelled inert gas mixture compris[es] carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one gas generant.”

Canterberry does not cure the deficiencies in Galbraith because Canterbury is silent

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

about details of a fire suppression device and its operation. As such, Canterbury also does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned limitation.

The Examiner has not identified any portion of Galbraith or Canterbury that teaches or suggests the above-mentioned limitation. While the Examiner states that “the gas generant [of Galbraith is] formulated to pyrotechnically produce an inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one gas generant,” this language is not what is actually recited in claim 1. Office Action of August 13, 2009, p. 2. Rather, claim 1 recites that the dispelled inert gas mixture, not the inert gas mixture pyrotechnically produced by the gas generant, comprises carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one gas generant.

In addition, there is no reason in the applied references, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself to modify the references in the manner asserted by the Examiner. The Examiner states “[i]t would have been obvious . . . to have modified the device of Galbraith et al. by using a non-azide, non-azole composition to produce an inert gas mixture as has been taught by Canterbury et al. to produce a safe gas mixture.” Office Action of August 13, 2009, p. 3. However, even if the apparatus of Galbraith was modified to include the composition of Canterbury, the claimed invention would not be produced because the apparatus of Galbraith would include cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, and/or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76. Therefore, as described above, additional CO<sub>2</sub> would be produced by the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, and/or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76. As such, the apparatus of Galbraith, as modified by Canterbury, would not be configured to dispel an inert gas mixture, the dispelled inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one gas generant.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-14, 18, 22-25, 96-100, and 115 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from allowable claim 1.

**Serial No. 10/727,088**  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

Claims 57-65, 69, 72-75, 77, 78, and 101-106

Galbraith and Canterbury, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 57 because neither reference teaches or suggests the limitations of “igniting at least one non-azide, non-azole, non-aminoguanidine nitrate, non-triaminoguanidine nitrate gas generant to produce an inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide” and “dispersing the inert gas mixture into a space to extinguish a fire, the dispersed inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration produced by ignition of the at least one gas generant such that the space comprises carbon dioxide at a concentration less than or equal to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration of carbon dioxide.” Galbraith and Canterbury do not teach or suggest these limitations for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In addition, there is no reason in the applied references, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself to modify the references in the manner asserted by the Examiner for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 58-65, 69, 72-75, 77, 78, and 101-106 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from allowable claim 57.

Claim 116

Galbraith and Canterbury, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitation in claim 116 of “the fire suppression system configured to dispel, at an exit thereof, the first gas mixture and a second gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide into a space to provide carbon dioxide at a concentration less than or equal to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration of carbon dioxide in the space.” Galbraith does not teach or suggest this limitation because CO<sub>2</sub> is produced by the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76, and the solid propellant 14. Nothing in Galbraith teaches or suggests that the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76 combined with the



**Serial No. 10/727,088**  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

CO<sub>2</sub> produced by the solid propellant 14 is dispelled into a space at a concentration less than or equal to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration of carbon dioxide. Rather, since the gases exiting the apparatus of Galbraith include CO<sub>2</sub> from the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76 and from the solid propellant 14, the CO<sub>2</sub> dispelled by the apparatus would be at a concentration greater than the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration of carbon dioxide.

Canterberry does not cure the deficiency in Galbraith because Canterberry is silent about details of a fire suppression device and its operation. Therefore, Canterberry does not teach or suggest a fire suppression system that is configured to dispel, at an exit thereof, the first gas mixture and a second gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide into a space to provide carbon dioxide at a concentration less than or equal to the Immediately Harmful to Life or Health concentration of carbon dioxide in the space. Furthermore, as described previously, while Canterberry teaches the amount of carbon dioxide produced by combustion of gas generating compositions that include 5-aminotetrazole (an azole) as the non-azide fuel, Canterberry does not teach or suggest the amount of carbon dioxide produced by a non-azide, non-azole, non-aminoguanidine nitrate, non-triaminoguanidine nitrate gas generant. While Canterberry teaches that oxamide may be used as the fuel, Canterberry does not teach or suggest specific compositions that include oxamide. Therefore, Canterberry does not teach or suggest the amounts of carbon dioxide produced upon combustion of a composition that includes oxamide. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect an oxamide-containing composition, upon combustion, to produce a greater amount of carbon dioxide than is produced by a similar composition that contains 5-aminotetrazole for the reasons previously described.

In addition, there is no reason in the applied references, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself to modify the references in the manner asserted by the Examiner for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Claim 117

Galbraith and Canterbury, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 117 because neither reference teaches or suggests the limitation of “the fire suppression system configured to dispel, at an exit thereof, at least a portion of the inert gas mixture, the dispelled inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one non-azide, non-azole gas generant.” Galbraith does not teach or suggest these limitations for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 116. Specifically, Galbraith does not teach or suggest that the inert gas mixture, which its apparatus is configured to dispel, comprises carbon dioxide in a concentration equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one non-azide, non-azole gas generant. Rather, Galbraith teaches the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> from the cooling material 38, magnesium carbonate containing propellant 72, or magnesium carbonate cooling bed 76. Canterbury does not cure the deficiency in Galbraith because Canterbury does not teach that the fire suppression system is configured to dispel, at an exit thereof, at least a portion of the inert gas mixture, the dispelled inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one non-azide, non-azole gas generant.

In addition, there is no reason in the applied references, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself to modify the references in the manner asserted by the Examiner for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 118

Galbraith and Canterbury, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 118 because neither reference teaches or suggests the limitation of “the fire suppression system configured to dispel, at an exit thereof, the inert gas mixture as pyrotechnically produced into a space, the space comprising carbon dioxide at less than approximately 4% by volume.” Galbraith and Canterbury do not teach or suggest these

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

limitations for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 116.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Further in View of U.S. Patent No. 6,096,147 to Taylor *et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 5,882,036 to Moore *et al.*

Claims 15, 70, 79, 80, 94, and 95 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,538,568 to Taylor *et al.* ("Taylor") and U.S. Patent No. 5,882,036 to Moore *et al.* ("Moore"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The teachings of Taylor and Moore are summarized on p. 21 of the January 11, 2007 Response.

The nonobviousness of independent claims 1 and 57 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claims, which respectively depend therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. See *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), see also M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As such, dependent claims 15, 70, 79, 80, 94, and 95 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Further in View of Taylor and U.S. Patent No. 6,481,746 to Hinshaw *et al.*

Claims 16, 71 and 81 through 90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury and further in view of Taylor and U.S. Patent No. 6,481,746 to Hinshaw *et al.* ("Hinshaw"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The teachings of Hinshaw are summarized on p. 27 of the March 2, 2009 Response.

The nonobviousness of independent claims 1 and 57 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claims, which respectively depend therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. See In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As such, dependent claims 16, 71, and 81-90 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Further in View of U.S. Patent No. 5,739,460 to Knowlton et al.

Claims 19-21 and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,739,460 to Knowlton et al. ("Knowlton"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The teachings of Knowlton are summarized on p. 24 of the January 11, 2007 Response.

The nonobviousness of independent claims 1 and 57 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claims, which respectively depend therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. See In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As such, dependent claims 19-21 and 76 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Further in View of U.S. Patent No. 6,116,348 to Drakin

Claims 26-28, 31-45, 48, 49, and 53-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,116,348 to Drakin ("Drakin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The teachings of Drakin are summarized on p. 20 of the October 31, 2007 Response.

The nonobviousness of independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claims, which depend therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent

Serial No. 10/727,088  
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

claim from which it depends is obvious. See In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), see also M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As such, dependent claims 26-28, 31-45, 48, 49, and 53-56 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Drakin and Further in View of Taylor and Moore

Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and Drakin, and further in view of Taylor, and Moore. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The nonobviousness of independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claim, which depends therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. See In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), see also M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As such, dependent claim 46 is allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Drakin and Further in View of Taylor and Hinshaw

Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and Drakin, and further in view of Taylor, and Hinshaw. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The nonobviousness of independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claim, which depends therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. See In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), see also M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Serial No. 10/727,088  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

As such, dependent claim 47 is allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Drakin and Further in View of Knowlton

Claims 50-52 and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and Drakin, and further in view of Taylor, and Knowlton. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The nonobviousness of independent claims 1 and 57 precludes a rejection of the above-mentioned claims, which respectively depend therefrom, because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. See *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

As such, dependent claims 50-52 and 76 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Galbraith in View of Canterbury and Further in View of Hinshaw

Claims 107-114 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galbraith in view of Canterbury, and further in view of Hinshaw. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The obviousness rejection of claims 107-114 is improper because the applied references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In addition, there is no reason in the applied references, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself to combine the applied references in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

The applied references do not teach or suggest the limitation in claim 107 of "the fire suppression system configured to dispense, at an exit thereof, the inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration pyrotechnically

**Serial No. 10/727,088**  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

produced by the at least one gas generant.” Galbraith and Canterbury do not teach or suggest this limitation for substantially the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Hinshaw does not cure this deficiency in Galbraith and Canterbury because nothing in Hinshaw teaches a fire suppression system that is configured to dispense an inert gas mixture comprising carbon dioxide in a concentration substantially equal to the concentration pyrotechnically produced by the at least one gas generant.

In addition, there is no reason in the applied references, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself to modify the references in the manner asserted by the Examiner. The Examiner states “[i]t would have been obvious . . . to have made the gas generant of Galbraith and Canterbury et al. comprising a combination of the elements as taught by Taylor et al. and Hinshaw et al. since Taylor et al. and Hinshaw et al. teach such elements for forming a gas generant are know[n] in the art and the combination of these elements would properly form a gas generant.” Office Action of August 13, 2009, p. 7. While the Examiner’s reason for combining the applied references refers to Taylor, Applicants herein treat the obviousness rejection as being in light of Galbraith, Canterbury, and Hinshaw since the Examiner did not specifically include Taylor in the obviousness rejection. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. M.P.E.P. § 2143.01 (emphasis in original). Since nothing in Galbraith, Canterbury, or Hinshaw suggests the desirability of the combination, the Examiner’s reason for combining the applied references appears to be a hindsight attempt to gather elements for bringing them together with the benefit of Applicants’ disclosure.

Dependent claims 108-114 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from an allowable base claim.

Serial No. 10/727,088  
**FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY**

### CONCLUSION

Applicants consider claims 1 and 57 to be generic, and note that upon allowance of a generic claim, claims depending therefrom in a non-elected species, namely claims 29, 30, 66, and 67, would also be allowable.

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-67, 69-90, and 94-119 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine A. Hamer  
Registration No. 47,628  
Attorney for Applicants  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: [REDACTED]  
KAH/kso/slm  
Document in ProLaw